

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD OF THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2005 AT 7:00 P.M. IN THE CLARK MEMORIAL CLUBHOUSE, 19 NORTH 9<sup>TH</sup> STREET, CLARKDALE, ARIZONA**

A regular meeting of the Design Review Board of the Town of Clarkdale was held on Wednesday, May 11, 2005, at 7:00 p.m. in the Clark Memorial Clubhouse, 19 North 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Clarkdale, AZ.

**Board Members:**

|               |               |         |
|---------------|---------------|---------|
| Chairperson   | Ed Knight     | Present |
| Board Members | Hank Stevens  | Present |
|               | Peggy Chaikin | Present |
|               | Ellie Bauer   | Present |
|               | Anke Pitrella | Present |

**Staff:**

|                                |                   |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Community Development Director | Steven Brown      |
| Planning Manager               | Beth Escobar      |
| Planner II                     | Normalinda Zuniga |

**Others in Attendance:** None

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Knight called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
2. **ROLL CALL:** Chairperson Knight noted all members were present.
3. **MINUTES:** Board Member Bauer made a motion to approve the minutes of April 28, 2005. Board Member Chaiken seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.
4. **REPORTS:**  
**Chairperson's Report:** The Chairperson reported that he was not selected to fill the vacant Town Council seat, so he would be continuing his term with the Design Review Board . Community Development Department Director Brown stated that the Board has a design review application on their agenda tonight and that the applicant was present.
5. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.

Chairman Knight made a motion to address the new business on the agenda, the Design Review Application, prior to addressing the Old Business. Board Member Bauer seconded and the motion passed unanimously.



**NEW BUSINESS:** Discussion and Possible action on a Design Review Application.

**Purpose of Design Review:**

“The purpose of the Design Review is to review the exterior design of proposed new buildings, proposed alterations to buildings and major development or redevelopment projects, which do not include new buildings within the Town of Clarkdale, in order to assure that new development or redevelopment is compatible with the surrounding environment, and to preserve and protect the integrity and character of the Town of Clarkdale, as applicable.” (*Zoning Code, Chapter Five, Section W*)

Charles Montgomery, owner of Highland Village Apartments, has submitted a Design Review Application for new decks at the apartment complex. Mr. Montgomery has asked that this application be reviewed by the full board. Highland Village Apartments is a 48-apartment unit complex located off Lanny Ave., north of the Foothills Terrace subdivision.

The application proposes 22 6' x 8' decks for a total of 1056 square feet. The application includes a schematic of the deck design, and a map of the apartment complex showing where the decks will be placed, along with construction details. Also included in the packet are photos of the complex.

If the Board approves the application, Mr. Montgomery will need to submit a building permit that will be reviewed by, among others, the Building Department and the Fire Department.

**Staff Recommendation:**

The Design Review Board reviews applications for design approval of new construction, alterations, additions, or renovations to existing buildings or structures and has the power to approve, conditionally approve, or disapprove all such requests. The decisions should be based on the following criteria:

1. **ARCHITECTURAL MERIT:** The architecture and design shall be visually compatible with the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.
2. **PROPORTION:** The relationship of the width of the building or structure to its height shall be visually compatible with the buildings, structures and places to which it is related or shall be maintained as original whenever feasible.
3. **OPENINGS:** The relationship of the width of the windows and doors, to the height of windows and doors in the building shall be visually compatible with buildings, structures and places to which it is related.
4. **PATTERN:** The relationships of solids to voids in a facade of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with buildings, structures and places to which they are related.



5. **SPACING:** The relationship of the building to the open space between it and the adjoining buildings shall be visually compatible to the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.

6. **ENTRANCES, PORCHES AND PROJECTIONS:** The height, projection, supports and relationship to streets and sidewalks, of entrances, porches, awnings, canopies and balconies of a building shall be visually compatible to the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.

7. **MATERIAL, TEXTURE AND COLOR:** The materials, textures and colors of the facade of a building shall be visually compatible with the predominant materials, textures and colors used in the buildings and structures to which they are related.

8. **ROOFS:** The roof shape and materials of a building shall be visually compatible with the buildings to which it is related.

9. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS:** Doors, windows, eaves, cornices and other architectural details of a building or structure shall be visually compatible with buildings and structures to which they are related.

10. **ACCESSORY FEATURES:** Garages, carports, sheds, enclosures, walkways, stairways, and landings shall be visually compatible with buildings and structures to which they are related.

11. **LANDSCAPING:** Landscaping shall be visually compatible with the landscaping around the buildings, structures and places to which it is related.

12. **LIGHTING:** Any on-site illumination shall be architecturally compatible to the overall project and not create a negative or visually detrimental effect on the building or neighboring properties.

Staff recommends that if the Board chooses to approve this application, they do so based on the above criteria.

Mr. Charles Montgomery, 1200 Lanny Avenue and owner of Highland Village Apartments made a brief presentation regarding the proposed decks. He stated that he wants to provide some outside space for the upstairs apartments. Either the kitchen window or the bedroom window, depending on the model of the apartment, will be converted to a slider to access the decks.

Mr. Montgomery presented color samples of the deck material, and stated that he has decided to use Trex® material rather than redwood because it requires less maintenance. He hopes that the colors provide a light and cheerful feel.

The only decks visible from the roads outside the apartment complex will be those at building #4.



Board Member Chaiken stated that she had viewed the site because she was concerned about encroaching on the privacy of the backyards for the houses on Lisa, but feels there is enough of a space buffer that this would not be a problem.

Board Member Bauer stated that the decks would provide a nice human touch to the apartment complex, and that she had reviewed the design criteria by which the Design Review Board must base their decision, and felt that this project met the majority of the criteria very well.

Chairman Knight asked about the structural merit of these decks. Mr. Montgomery responded that he has had the decks engineered. Community Development Department Director Steven Brown pointed out that the Building Official would review the decks for structural integrity during the permitting process.

Board Member Bauer suggested lights be included in the Design. Mr. Montgomery agreed that this was a good suggestion. Board Member Chaiken asked about child safety. Mr. Montgomery stated that the deck design meets the safety standard of four-inch separation.

Board Member Pitrella asked if there would be a rent increase. Mr. Montgomery stated that there would not be an increase for one year for current residents, but there would be an increase for new residents.

Board Member Stevens asked about preventing the decks from becoming outside storage. Mr. Montgomery stated that he would change the wording in the rental agreement that currently prohibits outside storage to include the new decks.

Board Member Bauer motioned to accept the Design Review application as proposed for 22 decks, finding that it meets the criteria for approval. Board Member Stevens seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

**OLD BUSINESS:** Worksession on Hardscape Design Standards.

At this time, Board Member Stevens commented that the Staff Reports for design review applications do not need to include the "Purpose of the Design Review Board" and the Criteria, since the Board Members are familiar with this information. Board Member Stevens stated that he feels including this information is disrespectful to the Board Members, and assumes that they do not know their responsibility. He stated that it is his understanding that it is staff's responsibility to follow direction from the Board, not the other way around. Community Development Department Director Brown pointed out that the Board Members are not the only ones to receive or review these reports, and that is why this information is included on each report. Mr. Brown further stated that staff does follow the Board's direction, and it is their responsibility to serve as a focal point for all of the Boards and Commissions.

Chairman Knight stated that this discussion was not an agenda item and that the Board should move on to Old Business.

Planner II Zuniga offered a brief Power Point presentation to introduce the concept of Hardscape.



The Board Members discussed several points in this worksession:

- the charge of the Design Review Board is to develop hardscape standards
- having a variety of trails and pathways, from natural to more developed
- including shade for rest areas
- including bike racks at rest areas
- variety of surfaces available for trails
- use of solar lighting
- including a southwest flavor in the design
- various standards for different grades of trail
- best width of trails
- safety and design of multi-use trails
- developing a design philosophy
- use more 'friendly' language in the ordinance
- including graphics and illustrations in the new ordinance
- continuing to work with the Planning Commission and Parks and Recreation Board to develop a cohesive trail development standard.
- maintenance and ownership of systems once developed

The Board directed staff to gather additional information regarding hardscape standards, specifically what other communities have adopted, and include information on options and costs, and report back at the next regular meeting for a continued worksession.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Board Member Stevens motioned the meeting adjourn. Board Member Bauer seconded the motion. The motion was unanimous. The meeting adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

**APPROVED BY:**

**SUBMITTED BY:**

---

Ed Knight  
Chairperson

---

Beth Escobar  
Planning Manager